

REMARKS

As noted in the interview summary provided by the examiners on January 5, 2006, an interview was conducted during which no agreement was reached. Applicant's representative respectfully thanks the examiners for taking the time to conduct this interview and for the assistance provided during the interview.

Applicant's representative agreed to investigate the claimed term "predetermined pattern" and to identify specific examples of such from within the specification. Applicant's representative respectfully notes the existence of specification support for this term at, among other places within the specification, pages 9-10. See, e.g., page 9, lines 26-31 and page 10, lines 15-24. Various of the aspects disclosed in these portions of the specification are articulated within the new dependent claims 68-70. Also, Applicant's representative notes that presently pending claim 11 is directed to the predetermined pattern limitation, specifying that the predetermined pattern includes a login failure message communicated from the access provider to the access requestor.

As suggested during the interview, Applicant's representative finds no disclosure within the cited Eichsaedt and Cox references that suggests monitoring of packets "directed from at least one of the access providers to at least one of the access requestors" for a predetermined pattern, as recited by claim 1. Moreover, the references are each remiss of any teaching or suggestion of the features recited by claims 11 and the new claims 68-70 with respect to monitoring of packets "directed from at least one of the access providers to at least one of the access requestors" for an indication of "a login failure message communicated from the access provider", "a login request message", "a signature located at a specific offset from an end of the data packet communicated from the access provider to the access requestor", and "login failure reasons".

Finally, Applicants representative agreed to review the prosecution history to confirm that the Cox reference was adequately addressed and distinguished. Applicant's representative has done so and is satisfied that the record is complete, directing the Examiner's attention to Applicant's representative submitted "Amendment to Reply to Action of June 15, 2005", page

11, 5th paragraph, and "Amendment to Reply to Action of December 6, 2004", page 11, 5th paragraph. Additionally, Applicant's representative provides the following brief comments, with hopes of advancing prosecution. Cox, like the primary reference, Eichstaedt, inspects packets that are received from the access requestor, not responses received from the access provider (e.g., those directed from the access provider to the access requestor, as claimed). See, e.g., Cox, col. 1, lines 30-37, col. 2, lines 5-8, col. 3, lines 32-34, col. 3, line 55-col. 4, line 4.

Lastly, to assist prosecution of the Application, Applicant's representative identifies some of the support found within the specification for the limitations presented by the new claims 58-62 and 64 that were added in the response to the final action.

Claim number	Exemplary support within the specification
58	Page 10, lines 25-31; Page 12, lines 3-15, 23-24, Page 18, line 22-24
59	Page 12, line 26- Page 13, line 7
60	Page 13, lines 12-22
61	Page 13, line 27- Page 14, line 17
62	Page 18, line 24-Page 19, line 4
64	Page 19, lines 5-13

Claims 63, 65 and 66 are cancelled.

Applicant asks that all claims be examined in view of the amendment to the claims.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/2/2006


W. Karl Renner
Reg. No. 41,265

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331
40319838.doc